the superior student

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE INTER-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE SUPERIOR STUDENT

Volume 4, Number 3
Boulder, Colorado
April, 1961

On British Honors
An American View *Page 2*
Two British Views *Page 6*

The Argonne Semester *Page 12*

Humanities and General Honors *Page 14*

Motivation to Seek Advanced Training *Page 16*

Conference—College Committee on Outstanding Students *Page 17*

The Colloquium
at CCNY *Page 23*
at New Mexico *Page 24*
at Boston College *Page 25*
Brief Descriptions *Page 27*

Notes and Comments *Page 30*

ON BRITISH HONORS

The British and Commonwealth universities have long made the distinction between Pass and Honors degrees. Frank Aydelotte at Swarthmore seems to have made the first conscious adaptation of the British practice to conditions in American colleges.[1]

It seems pertinent to keep our eye on the Honors scene in Britain today in view of the fact that the provincial "red brick" universities, now well established there, are confronting conditions and problems which more closely parallel those in our own large state universities. Moreover, new colleges are emerging in Britain and important ideas are being tried out in places like Brighton and Sussex.

We here invite your attention to a look at British practice by Naphtali Lewis, Coordinator of Honors at Brooklyn College, and to a critical and suggestive discussion of Honors from the inside of the British experience. We think that Dr. Vick's paper at the Gulbenkian Conference, here reproduced, will be of special interest to our readers, particularly so to those concerned with Honors in science. A further excerpt describing the Sussex concept is particularly relevant to our concern with general as distinct from departmental Honors.

We feel that the time may be near for serious conversations on Honors between academics in Britain and the United States to their mutual benefit.

---

[1]See *Breaking the Academic Lockstep* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944) chaps. 3 and 4.

THE LESSONS OF BRITISH HONORS EXPERIENCE[1]: *An American View*

NAPHTALI LEWIS[2]

This statement was prepared as part of a report on the New Scholars' Program at Brooklyn College.[3]

In the next few years we will, I suspect, frequently be asked questions like, "Isn't your Scholars' Program really just another attempt to import or adapt the British tutorial system to American undergraduate education?" To such questions the answer is quite simply, "No." Actually, the Scholars' Program is (conceptually, at least) much more flexible in adjusting the individual student's program and rate of progress to his ability and potential.

However, the practices and results of British undergraduate education can be instructive to us in several ways. The facts, impressions, and conclusions recorded below are the result of my conversations with a sizable cross-section of the people working in and close to British higher education—from members of officialdom to lecturers and tutors in arts, sciences, and social sciences; from masters and principals of colleges to British teachers and American exchange teachers in secondary schools preparing students to compete for university admission. Of the people I consulted and conversed with, some were complacent, some even enthusiastic about the status quo, others were sharply critical. In this investigation, conducted over a period of six weeks in April and May 1960, I concentrated on "Oxbridge" (Oxford and Cambridge) and London, with most of the time spent in London where, with its largely nonresidential colleges set in the country's major urban complex, the underlying general situation is closer to that of our municipal colleges than in residential, "ivy-league" Oxbridge. The following remarks will deal mainly with common essentials; differences of detail between colleges and universities—the result of local autonomy or tradition—are generally unimportant for our purposes.

CURRENT BRITISH PRACTICE

A major post-war development at Oxbridge and London is the practical disappearance of the general or ordinary bachelor's degree, which requires two or three years of less intensive or less specialized study than does the Honors degree. With a few exceptions due to special circumstances, all undergraduates who now succeed in gaining admission to these universities qualify for, and take, the Honors degree. The Honors B.A. or B.Sc. is the path to graduate work and research for those students interested in such careers, and offers prestige and certain financial rewards to others. With the notable exception of the four-year humanities and social science curricula at Oxford known as "Greats" and "Modern Greats", the Honors degree normally requires three years of study, and in attain-

[1]See W. R. Gaede, "Talented Students in Western Europe," THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (November 1959) 3.
[2]Coordinator, College Honors Program, Brooklyn College.
[3]See THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (March 1961) 28.

ing this degree at the age of twenty-one the British student has, if he is really good, usually reached a stage of advancement comparable to the American M.A. But his *entire* undergraduate course of study has been confined to the single area of what we would call his "major." The British undergraduate is enrolled not merely in a college but in a subject-matter department; he "reads" (as they say) for his degree only in his own special subject and any related ones that his department may list as prescriptions or options. For example, the student "reading" for his degree in History studies *only* history (especially British), with the option of including a year of economics or political theory in place of one history course; the student in Mathematics does only pure and applied mathematics or mathematics with physics; the candidate for the degree in Natural Sciences takes two or three sciences during the first year or two and then completes his course by specializing in one of these sciences.

Thus, these courses of study correspond more or less to the American student's specialization in his junior, senior and first graduate years. Both the American and the British student are supposed to have attained their general education in the years immediately preceding this specialization. Whatever may have been true in the past, the notion that the needs of general education are satisfactorily met in the British secondary school is seriously questioned in many quarters. A general complaint is that under the intense competition for college admission the sixth form (i.e., the last year of secondary school) has deteriorated into one big cram course aimed at passing college entrance exams. The universities complain of the inadequacy of the students' written English, and Oxford will institute this year an entrance examination in the use of English. High school and college teachers in all subjects complain that the students become very adept at rote learning but cannot apply what they have memorized. As a result some departments in some colleges have begun to give their own entrance examinations in an attempt to distinguish students who can really think from those who can pass the traditional examinations with high marks by just memorizing.

The conclusion seems inescapable that the British pattern of extreme undergraduate specialization is one that we should avoid as premature for our students.

FULL-TIME EDUCATION

But if their curricular pattern leaves us unresponsive, some British university procedures do have pertinence for the Scholars' Program. The first fact to be noted is that between eighty and ninety percent of the 100,000 undergraduates in British universities are there on some form of scholarship. Furthermore, though the academic year spreads over only eight or nine months, the scholarship stipend covers also the long summer vacation, which the scholar is free to use as he pleases for study, travel, etc. This concept of the full-time, year-'round student is one that the Scholars' Program should try to inculcate. This concept does *not* mean that the student studies all the time and does nothing else. It *does* mean that as a student his fundamental occupation, year in year out, is with the exciting business of learning. The development of such an attitude in the Scholars'

Published monthly during the academic year by the University of Colorado on behalf of the University Honors Information Service of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student at McKenna 229, University of Colorado. Sent free of charge to interested personnel on request; back copies available at fifteen cents each. Second class postage paid at Boulder, Colorado.

Program might eventually also have a beneficial effect on the intellectual tone of the campus as a whole.

INDEPENDENCE

The British undergraduate is thrown almost completely upon his own resources—too much so, in the opinion of some. American students, for example, having been given formal assistance or instruction in such matters, are often more effiicent in using libraries, preparing bibliographies, etc. The British student has to learn to organize his work himself. The recitation class, basic to our system, is unknown in their colleges. There the basic method of instruction is by lecture (in the arts) or lecture and laboratory (in the sciences), supplemented by informal teaching on a personal basis (on which more later on in this article). The student is also free to audit any lectures he wishes, but many students (especially in the sciences) feel too busy with required courses to avail themselves of this privilege.

A course syllabus is merely the list of topics printed in the university catalogue or handbook; in addition, the lecturer usually draws up a list of basic works for reading or reference. Beyond that the student is on his own. His reading list is not divided into specific portions to be done at specific times. He does not know what the topic of the next lecture will be unless the lecturer announces it. In most departments no attempt is made to keep laboratory exercises or written assignments in step with lectures.

EXAMINATIONS

At the end of one, two, or three years (the period varies with the university or the department) the student is called upon to demonstrate his mastery of his subject(s) in a series of three-hour essay examinations (plus laboratory practicals for the science students), the results of which determine whether he receives his degree with First-class, Second-class, or Third-class Honors. Degrees are awarded not by the college but by the university, which is also the examining body, setting uniform examinations in the different subjects for the students in all its colleges.

The number of examinations that a student takes at one time varies with the university and the department. Oral examinations are used on occasion. In most of the sciences, as well as in many of the arts subjects, one of the written examinations tests the student's ability to translate from a foreign-language work in his field. On all the essay examinations the student is required to answer only a few questions out of a larger number (e.g. four out of ten). The idea behind this wide choice is that the student is left free to write on those subjects where he feels he can demonstrate his best ability. The examiners who read the papers look not so much for mere facts as for command of material and depth of understanding. No paper is rated first-class unless it is superior in expression as well as in content.

To attempt to imitate the British pattern in these matters is neither necessary nor practical for us. But the awareness of their practices can be helpful to us in preparing examinations, and also in our broader purpose of encouraging students to self-reliance.

TUTORIALS

Most remarkable, and most useful to us, is the way in which, within a system of uniform prescriptions and tests more rigid even than ours, the British universities still provide for flexibility in adjusting the student's work to his individual needs and abilities. This flexibility is provided through the personal, informal teaching known as "tutorials" at Oxford,

"supervision" at Cambridge, "essay classes" at London. These are weekly or fortnightly sessions, usually of one hour's duration, at which the teacher meets the students assigned to him either singly, or more commonly (except at Oxford) in groups generally of two to five but sometimes as many as eight. The students are sometimes grouped according to ability. They are rotated among different teachers at least once a year, sometimes more frequently.

Normally each student writes a paper for each session: this procedure, traditional at Oxbridge and practiced in varying degrees elsewhere, now also serves the function of teaching the present generation of students to write English. In the individual tutorial the student reads his paper to the teacher, who may question, comment, make suggestions for further work, etc. In the group session one student's paper is read aloud and provides the basis for discussion by all present; the rest of the group turn in their papers to the teacher, who returns them with his written comments at or before the next meeting.

The purpose of these meetings is not to *cover* the student's course (which the student does in the lecture and laboratory), but to probe, within the broad area of the subject, into aspects and problems in which the student may be specially interested or in which the teacher may feel that the student needs to do more work. In other words, these sessions, in which the student often gets his best and most effective teaching, are not a formal course; they do not have a fixed plan or syllabus; their purpose is to provide personal supervision of the student's work and progress, and the skilful teacher "plays it by ear," feeling free, as one teacher put it, to "go into absolutely anything," adjusting assignments and suggestions to the individual student's interests, strengths, and weaknesses. In this way the top-flight student, at least, goes far beyond the normal course syllabus.

THE TEACHER

It goes almost without saying that the kind of guidance and supervision the student gets varies widely with the interest and competence of the teacher. There are many teachers who labor sensitively and devotedly at encouraging each of their charges individually. Such teachers often arrange additional ad hoc instruction to serve students' special needs, and when a student develops an interest beyond their own competence they arrange with a colleague in their own or if necesary in another college to take him on for a few sessions or even for a whole term. On the other hand, it is no secret that many teachers simply go through the motions in purely routine fashion. A frequently heard complaint about Oxbridge these days is that they are "scraping the barrel" to provide tutors and supervisors for their increased student body. It happens not infrequently that a student moves from a second-class to a first-class rating (or vice versa) after changing from one teacher to another.

The moral of this aspect of British experience is obvious both as to initial selection of mentors and teachers in the Scholars' Program, and as to flexibility in transferring students from one teacher to another, even, where advisable and feasible, to an off-campus scholar or expert.

THE STUDENT

But the quality of the teacher is only one of two main factors in the situation. The other is the quality of the student. This raises the interesting question of which students benefit most from the kind of education afforded by tutorials, supervision, and essay classes. A recent blast by an Oxford don charges that tutorial time and effort are wasted on

the mediocre student doing a routine job, and on the able student interested only in passing his exams as high as possible. There is even some talk of a broad investigation of the effectiveness of the tutorial system.

There is fairly general agreement that the student who profits most from this system of personal guidance is the self-motivated student of top ability. He does wider reading and more advanced work; he is able to organize his research and writing with little or no help; he has curiosity and drive, which carry him on his own initiative beyond the teacher's suggestions. He often has a special interest—professional, intellectual, social, political, etc. – which the skilful and sympathetic teacher helps him to capitalize on in his work.

It is also worth noting that in the opinion of two teachers I spoke to—both social scientists, as it happens—the system is most beneficial to the student who is intelligent but needs guidance, educing potential (if it is there) in a way that nothing else can.

It seems fair to conclude that at its best, i.e. given the right student with the right teacher, such personalized education produces remarkable results that are probably unobtainable in any other way. Here, it seems to me, is the most important lesson that British experience holds out to us, encouraging us to set our sights as high as possible in the Scholars' Program.

BRITISH HONORS

The following excerpts are from the report of the First Gulbenkian Educational Discussion, a meeting of prominent British educators held November 25-27, 1960. This report was published in Universities Quarterly, *Vol. 15, No. 2 (March 1961).*[1] *Permission to publish was kindly granted by the editor, Boris Ford, Professor in the Institute of Education, University of Sheffield.*

HONORS AND SPECIALIZATION

F. A. VICK[2]

Particularly in London and the Civic universities, there has been a great tendency since the war to concentrate on single-subject Honors[3] courses. Many of us feel that although these courses may be right for some people who are going on to be the academics, scholars and researchers of the future, they are not necessarily right for others, nor for the kind of career for which those students may be required or which they may want after graduation. There seem to be needs for other kinds of courses within the universities, quite apart from the possibilities of liberal arts colleges that have been mentioned on the fringe of or outside the universities.

I propose to discuss this topic in relation to the provision of special Honors courses, general Honors courses, and finally pass or general degree courses. The university system as a whole in this country, although not necessarily in one

[1]Published by Turnstile Press, London. The first selection is from pages 164-171, the second from pages 149-150.
[2]Director, Atomic Energy Research Establishment, Harwell, England.
[3]The British "Honours" has been Americanized throughout.

place, should be able to provide at least this range to cater for different kinds of people, and for their different needs in the future.

The first difficulty presented by these (single-subject Honors) courses is the high standard of knowledge based on school subjects that is required for entry. In order to be adequately prepared, a boy or girl must have chosen to take the necessary subjects at about age sixteen, and at that age the criteria upon which such a choice is based, may be quite false—a liking for the subject at that stage may be no guide to its treatment at university level, and may be inspired by no more than the attraction of a particular teacher, or the glamor of a fashionable subject like physics or quite irrelevant personal considerations. Such a student may reach the university only to find that the subject is not what he would then wish to choose.

The second difficulty is the extent to which these courses are overloaded with detail. New members of staff invited to contribute to special Honors courses bring their own specialisms with them, and there is a great danger of constantly adding bits and pieces, both of subject-matter and of techniques. Such development, by addition and fragmentation instead of by integration, sets up great pressures for lengthening the course, but this does not help the student to see the subject as a whole. The good student can overcome this and even be stimulated by parts of the course, but in many cases the not-so-good student is just overwhelmed. Here, then, are the two main disadvantages of special Honors courses—early specialization pushed back into the schools because of the entrance requirements and overloading of the courses themselves. What can be done about them?

There are, I think, four possibilities:

1. To defer real specialization, for professional purposes, to post-graduate research periods, or to higher degree courses based partly on examinations.

2. To rethink our courses in the light of developing understanding of fundamental unities of subject matter.

3. To enable students at some point—but not at all points—to reach the frontiers of their subject.

4. To treat the learning of techniques, inevitably necessary for professional competence, as part of the total educational process and not merely as training.

I mention the first point without elaborating on it; the others I can best illustrate from my own field of physics.

UNITY IN PHYSICS

Advances in physics have enabled or should have enabled courses to be shortened and not lengthened, because of our much better understanding of certain aspects of the subject which can lead to getting right down to the fundamentals and thereby linking things together. One may take as an example solid state physics. I find that Honors students in their final years get really excited at finding that what they originally thought to be separate bits—for example, the photographic process, the barrier-layer rectifier, electron emission from solid surfaces, scintillation counters, semiconductors, transistors—all come out of a single presentation of the basic concepts of the subject and that all these are linked together. A unity emerges about that aspect of the course which is quite different from what a student may get from some of the older textbooks. In certain respects some of the sciences are not so far advanced as physics, and in the final year, instead of gathering together, there is a further specialization. But an Honors course of this kind fails unless it can present something of a unity and that can only be done by a conscious rethinking

of the course each year, interrelating one bit with another, and by concentrating on the central idea of fundamental unification.

FRONTIERS OF KNOWLEDGE

It is absolutely essential for a student to reach the frontiers of knowledge somewhere, to be in contact with the problems which are engaging the best minds in science now. This does not mean that he must reach the frontier everywhere. If the first part of the course is regarded as a broad foundation, there can be extension upwards in particular directions—it does not matter greatly which, provided that the student is guided by people who have first-hand experience in that direction, and are excited about advances in that particular subject. They must be able to convey, in their own persons, the quality of that excitement and the continuing vitality of their subject as one in which by no means all the problems are solved, and which by no means developed in the logical order of the textbook. In that way a student will get the experience, not over a wide front, perhaps, but over certain aspects, of going beyond the textbooks to original papers, to symposia and current discussions by people who are actually hammering out some of today's problems.

The essential reason for doing this is to stretch the student's mind, in one direction or another, to the point at which he has some concept of what the subject is like *now*.

HONORS TECHNIQUES IN SCIENCE

Special Honors courses, and in my opinion, too much of them, are concerned partly with techniques. Techniques are a necessary part of professional competence in a subject, but I consider it unnecessary to concentrate so much on them as is customary. Moreover, the learning of such techniques as are necessary can be part of the educational process and not just a matter of training.

Let me again illustrate from my own field. In the older type of course of my own student days one found an experiment set out on the bench of which the object was to measure the electrical resistance of a particular conductor accurately. The first impulse was to say, "I have done this before. This is just like school." In fact, of course, it is not so because the measurement of a resistance to really high accuracy, particularly of some types of material, is not an easy job. But the attitude of mind of a student confronted with this is to say, "Good heavens, have I still got to continue with this?"

I suggest that it is best to approach the student in different terms; to say, for example, "I would like you to investigate how the resistance of a piece of wire varies as you stretch it." With an elementary student, you put a certain amount of apparatus in front of him and he soon finds that he has got to get his temperatures constant and so on, otherwise the results go all over the place. He finds also that he has to measure very accurately, and eventually he may get some figures for the change of resistance with the change of length or the load put on the wire. He has to discover how best to present the information in order to interpret the results, and having got a relation between change in length and change in resistance, he can then be asked to calculate from the first principles what relation he would expect.

The first instinct of the student is often to look for a similar textbook calculation instead of working it out from first principles. But this having been done, a comparison of the calculated with the observed results will most certainly reveal a factor of three or four difference. If the student is asked, "Why this difference?"

his first reaction is to go back to his experiment and say, "Have I made a mistake?" Eventually he is convinced that his experimental results are all right and people have to learn to trust them. You then ask, "Can you suggest any reasons why there is this difference?" Students will respond very differently. Some of them go to an immense amount of trouble, use the library, investigate the properties of materials and all sorts of things and really feel that they are coming up to what to them is an unknown; other students just give up. This is one way in which you can very soon assess the capability and potentiality of a student.

In some cases one may say, "Well, it might be so and so. How would you find out? Will you please devise an experiment and test it yourself?" While he is doing this, a student is learning and stretching his techniques under the compulsion of seeking actual results. As he gains experience, instead of putting apparatus in front of him, you say, "Here is an exciting problem in physics. Will you devise an experiment that will enable you to tackle it." This step is, I think, absolutely essential, because in the older types of science courses it is the instructor who has done the main part of the science in choosing the right materials, the right circumstances, and the apparatus that will give the best kind of results, and then tells the student to "Carry on and do this experiment." That is not what the student will meet in the real world afterwards. He must start with an empty bench and find for himself what the important factors are, and by doing this, he will acquire a much more scientific approach. He will develop almost an instinct for the sensitivity of galvanometers, for example, because he will make a lot of mistakes: he will even burn out some of the suspensions, but never mind, the result is worth while.

So by reshaping a course, the time spent on practical work can be cut down, but a lot of my colleagues, who have not had time or incentive to stop and think, do not believe this. Instead, there is continuous pressure to increase the time spent on practical work. Of course, experience in a laboratory is absolutely essential—it corresponds to practical work in modern languages—but if the educational purpose of it is properly thought out from the beginning, the time given to it can be cut down.

A further advantage of devising a course in this way is that it provides for a continuous assessment of a student. If a student is set to work on the more advanced type of problem, in the way I have described, he can be asked to write a report on it as though for publication, and to lecture on it to his fellow students, than whom there are no more devastating critics. In this way all students will get some of the benefits from practical courses planned for each student according to his potentiality and capabilities.

Examinations cannot be wholly abolished because they do test certain qualities in students, but opportunities for continuous assessment in the way I have suggested enables examination pressures to be eased, and provide a better basis at the end for judging the capabilities of particular students.

To sum up, I suggest that the boundary conditions within which the pressures associated with special Honors courses can be relieved are a sufficiently broad-based beginning and a graduate year in which to provide the courses needed for particular professions.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL HONORS

I have said that special Honors courses are not necessarily suited to every type of student, and they do not necessarily give the right sort of background to a

man's future career. In reassessing the program of the Atomic Energy Establishment at Harwell, which has to change continuously, we find, among the 1500 or so graduates who are employed there, people whom it is extremely difficult to move about because they have specialized from an early age, perhaps in a field for which we have no longer any use.

In some cases it is the general Honors, particularly the two-subject Honors course, which gives me the people who can do the best research and the best work afterwards. Some natural combinations are physics and mathematics, physics and chemistry, physics and biology, physics and geology. Those are obvious, but physics and economics, physics and philosophy are also possible. For all these there can be a common core until the final year, during which the appropriate aspect of each subject can be chosen.

But if it is done properly the physics department must not devise its part of the general Honors course in isolation. The professor of physics must sit down with the professor of mathematics or of philosophy and say, "What course are we going to have for this man?" In economics some aspects of operational research may provide the special subject where the student can draw on his physics for possible applications to economic problems. Here the broad foundation has two components consciously related. The student does not reach the frontiers in physics in as many places as the man doing the special course, but over the two Honors subjects he may do so at more points and this stretches his mind in different directions. Some students are more stimulated by these interactions of aspects of different subjects than by the narrower range of the single-subject Honors course, and it is rubbish to say that the double Honors school of this kind is not a preparation for research. I have evidence to the contrary, and one or two people with this background are transforming their present departments. But general Honors courses like special Honors courses must be devised as a whole; they take much thought and preparation; given this they can be first-rate. Students from general Honors courses are likely to be specially useful as teachers and in industry, and they are certainly good for a great deal of research.

THE HONORS TEACHER

Treating practical work as an integral part of the educational process is the most effective way of bringing the senior and most experienced members of a department into contact with students. When a professor sits on a laboratory stool beside a student, as Blackett did at Manchester, and discusses the planning of an individual experiment, a true apprentice-master relationship can be established with all the advantages that attach to it. The laboratory is a natural setting for such personal relationships and in this the sciences may have an advantage over the arts. In examining microscopic sections in zoological or biological studies, the inexperienced student has first to be taught what to look for, and then has to learn to draw inferences from what he observes. It is exhausting to the teacher to undertake this work himself rather than delegate much of it to graduate students, but it provides unique opportunities for becoming acquainted with a student's general outlook and for detecting the blocks in his mental processes. To move from one student working on optics to a second working on electricity and a third on acoustics, and each time to become absorbed in their particular problems is, I repeat, one of the most exhausting but also one of the most fascinating forms of teaching.

You cannot treat living subjects—and I hope all university subjects are living subjects—in this way, unless the teachers are alive and remain so. Certainly in science this depends on the interaction of teaching and research. A department which is not consciously in the forefront in its own field will quickly become a dead department and no allocation of tutorial periods will replace continuous personal contacts in the laboratory with a first-rate teacher's enthusiasm for a living subject. The tutorial and the pastorial roles grow out of the communicated enthusiasm of the teacher which is sustained by research. I do not see how it can be otherwise.

GENERAL HONORS AT SUSSEX

J. S. FULTON[1]

Mr. Fulton began his description of a new educational approach at Sussex University with a reference to his own experience at Balliol as a pupil of A. D. Lindsay. Referring to the Oxford tutors of his day, he said:

The kind of course they offered to the young men was equally suited to the person who was going to be a scholar, the man who was going into the learned professions, and the man who was going into the hurly-burly of public life, into industry or into civil service.

It meant that people destined for quite different sorts of careers grew together in their undergraduate courses. The Gladstones and the Gilbert Murrays, so to speak, did, as undergraduates, the same sort of job in the same sort of way. This state of affairs at the universities affected the temper of discussion in Parliament, the tone of the Civil Service, and of public life generally. Today, by contrast, the university don has become, in his capacity as scholar, a professional, highly specialized individual. This, in turn, has affected his teaching of undergraduate courses.

The trend is, perhaps, even clearer in science than in arts. We should be asking ourselves whether the single-subject Honors course is giving a preparation which is right for the scholar-to-be. However you answer that one, I am by no means certain that it is all right for those who are not going to be scholars. As we accept more and more students who wish to use their university course not for a specialized study in a branch of learning to which they will devote the rest of their lives but as a general preparation for life, we must face this question.

At Sussex we are going to move away from the single-subject Honors course. In Arts, we propose to have no departments. Professors and lecturers will be appointed in subjects but not to departments. After a common first part (taken at the end of one year) the student in Arts will work in one of several schools. Of these there will be three and soon afterwards, we hope, four. First, a School of European Studies. The student will do a modern language and literature, and do it thoroughly (five papers out of nine or ten in his final examination). But he will also have to do some European history and some history of the country whose literature he is studying, and some philosophical study of the main ideas contributing to European civilization.

---

[1]Principal, University College of Sussex.

Secondly, there will be a School of English Studies, similiar in structure to the first. Thirdly, a School of Social Studies. I hope there will also be, before long, a school in the international field, where students will study a civilization other than that in which they have grown up; say, that of the Far East, or India, or Africa. Such regional studies will be bound together by a number of shared subjects such as comparative religion, the ebb and flow of colonialism, and the economy of under-developed countries.

In science we shall have a three-year Honors course in which three subjects out of four must be taken: i.e., three out of mathematics, biology, chemistry and physics. Those who wish to be crackerjacks in any one of these will have to stay on for a fourth year and do a further Honors examination or an M.Sc.

We would like to see what can be done about teaching methods. It is possible that, with this system of schools, we could have a fairly exiguous lecture system, so that we would not offer students lectures on every aspect of their departmental courses. Perhaps we might offer them broad lecture courses, and then by seminars and tutorials give them the slant they want in their particular field—French, German, Russian and so on. It is of great importance to see whether we can evolve some methods of teaching along these lines before the load comes on us.

Note: *In connection with the preceding discussion of British experience, we call attention to the provocative British work by Michael Young entitled* The Rise of Meritocracy 1870-2033: An Essay on Education and Equality, *(London: Thames and Hudson, 1958).*

THE ARGONNE SEMESTER: A Cooperative Program in Science[1]

A novel experiment in scientific education is being conducted by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest in cooperation with the Argonne National Laboratory, with assistance from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Under the plan, called the *Argonne Semester Program*, the ACM schools collectively send to the Laboratory a professor of biology, of chemistry and of physics for two summers and an academic year, and each semester they send ten outstanding undergraduate science students majoring in biology, chemistry and physics.

The students combine classroom instruction with half-time assignment to

[1]From a report on the program, copies of which may be obtained from Henry M. Halsted III, ACM Program Director, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago. A report also appeared in the March 1961 issue of the *Argonne National Laboratory News–Bulletin.*

one of three major research divisions of Argonne. In the fall semester the ten ACM students who come to Argonne are mostly seniors. A second group of ten students, generally second semester juniors, moves to Argonne in the spring semester. While they are on the site they serve as part-time research assistants to Argonne scientists and continue their academic work under the tutelage of the ACM faculty members. The professors offer advanced seminars in each of the three fields, an interdisciplinary seminar, and a small amount of tutorial work. They also supervise the preparation of the students' research reports which are based on their laboratory assignments.

During the semester the students work with Argonne projects in the mornings five days a week. The afternoons are for student seminars and independent study under the direction of the ACM faculty members. There are also tours of Argonne facilities and lectures by Argonne personnel. For this carefully worked out program of study and research ACM colleges have been willing to give their students a semester resident academic credit toward graduation, so that no student will have his graduation date delayed by participation.

The Program aims to provide to ACM faculty an opportunity to join with Argonne scientists in the conduct of research in their fields of interest making use of the superb scientific equipment of the Laboratory. To ACM students it provides the experience of participation as part of a select group of able students on the front lines of research and thus enables them to develop their knowledge and abilities and to deepen their understanding of research and of their field of interest. It serves also to foster the students' desire for advanced work and careers in science. To the ACM colleges it offers a way to maintain and increase their vigor in the fields of pure science and to promote between the campus and the Laboratory an interchange of ideas and information on science and science education. The Laboratory hopes, in the words of Frank Myers, its Associate Director for Education, "that each faculty member will return to his college with the feeling that he has refreshed his own research interests in an important endeavor of his own choosing and that each student will return with a mature appreciation of what research really is."

No single liberal arts college could keep such a program adequately staffed with faculty and outstanding students. Ten colleges of high academic standing, with a tradition of mutual respect and with facilities for joint operations, make such a program possible. This contact between science faculties and outstanding students from a group of small liberal arts colleges, on the one hand, and a leading scientific research organization, on the other, is a cooperative venture which is plowing new ground in undergraduate science in the Midwest. It represents a significant increase in the opportunities available to faculty members and to students in the cooperating colleges for experiences and intellectual growth in three basic science fields.

Other colleges and universities may find it fruitful to explore the possibility of parallel collaboration with appropriate research centers. Although the present example is from the scientific field, there seems to be no reason why fruitful arrangements might not also be worked out with research organizations in other fields.—The Editors.

Humanities and General Honors

JOHN ARTHOS[1]

In an American college in which courses cover large subjects, the important thing is always to return the students to the basic texts. Lectures as well as secondary works present ideas which often interest them, but too often they take the place of the understanding of what it is that provides the basis for all such interpretations. The teacher is always in a dilemma—he must assume that the students have a background of fundamental knowledge even while he knows that they do not. He is therefore obliged to require that they study at least a few of the primary texts very closely in order that they may begin to judge the generalizations that are being offered to them.

This seems to me a particularly necessary requirement for courses in the humanities, such as the one I have given on the Renaissance in the Honors Program at the University of Michigan. The course begins with an arbitrary contrast between Machiavelli and Saint Francis, and while thereafter the reading is grouped in three parts—in Humanism, in Artistic Theory, and in the Philosophy of Science—the initial contrast is maintained as the point to which the discussion and study continue to return.

Most of the students in this course were planning to concentrate in the sciences, and I came to believe that as a group they were superior in capacity to those I knew in English. I was deeply impressed by their ability and readiness to pursue matters many of them believed to be alien to their main interest. When a physics student saw that the developing realism of the Florentine painters could be related to the method of Machiavelli, and that the proportions of a Brunnelleschi church could be related to Petrarch's humanism, he was ready to begin the next step—to inquire into the relation of his own studies in physics to current discussions of the limits of objectivity. In short, I came to believe that such students were anxious for anything that would help them relate their special work to the very idea of the humanities. And I saw once more that when institutions fail to satisfy such desires, they do a great many students a great disservice.

I do not believe, however, that such purposes can be well satisfied by special, separate courses, whether in the sophomore or senior years. Whatever idea informs such a course should inform the student's entire program, or a substantial part of it. It comes down to this—the student must study intensively some of the primary documents of Western thought and expression, he must come to have as serious a regard for the study of humanistic texts as he has for the study of laboratory material. He must by this means learn that the matter of philosophy and literature is as responsibly founded as the matter of science.

As I see it, there are two factors in modern institutions that make this a generally impracticable aim in the organization of a four-year curriculum.

[1]Professor of English, University of Michigan.

The first is that students come to college with too little knowledge of the nature and uses of language and literature. By and large they must start from scratch. Special courses and even special programs must involve compromises in the presentation of the subject and the instructor must fall back on the hope that the students will make up some of the necessary knowledge on their own.

The second important consideration relates to the character of American universities, in which the department rather than the college is the primary organization. Students look towards specialization as their end, and, what is equally important, the instructors do so, too. The instructor's obligations to his own studies, particularly in research, are primary to him and to his institution.

Short of a program like that offered at Saint John's in Annapolis I do not believe that programs that would extend the principles in effect in the course I have described can be established in institutions in which the claims of departments are primary. Special courses that "cut across departmental lines" cannot be sustained long enough to provide students with a definite idea of what is central to all education.

I see only one way in which universities can work part way to such an end, apart from setting up certain requirements in addition to those of specialization, and that is by informing the programs in specialization with the idea that each special subject is part and parcel of other movements of thought, and that all study is to be related to the history of humanism itself.

I am not sure that Whitehead was right in judging that the genesis of modern scientific thought is to be found in the idea of fate that we meet in Aeschylus. The possibility that it may be true, however, is for me the justification for making the texts of Aeschylus or of any of the great thinkers of the past the foundation for specialization.

●

THE SOCIETY OF FELLOWS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY, the subject of a book of that title edited by CRANE BRINTON (Harvard University Press, 1959), is the history of Harvard's efforts to provide the necessary conditions for creative scholarship at the graduate level. For terms varying in length from three to six years the carefully selected Fellows are given room and board, paid a stipend and set at liberty to pursue any intellectual adventure that they find interesting and important. They must fulfill no academic requirements but a negative one: they may not do formal course work for a degree.

This book includes and brings up to date the earlier (1947) description of the Society by George C. Homans and Orville T. Bailey. It is a fascinating account of the thinking of Alfred North Whitehead, Lawrence Henderson, John Livingston Lowes, Charles Curtis and President Lowell. These distinguished scholars were led to promote the Society by "discontent with the opportunities for genius" in the prevailing graduate school programs. Among their ideas was the notion that an undergraduate Honors college would "provide recruits for the fellowship competition and transmit the influence of this competition and of the Society of Fellows to the whole body of students of Harvard College."

All who are concerned with the problem of creating a proper intellectual environment for the superior student at the undergraduate or graduate level will find this little book full of stimulating suggestions.

Honors Programs and Motivation to Seek Advanced Training

DONALD L. THISTLETHWAITE[1]

I believe the following observations will be of interest to readers of THE SUPERIOR STUDENT since they suggest that talented students who participate in Honors programs are stimulated to seek advanced graduate and professional degrees. The data have been abstracted from a larger study now in progress at the National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

A group of 1061 Merit Scholars and Certificate of Merit winners completed, at the end of their sophomore year in college, a questionnaire concerned with college experiences and future study plans. The group was selected by surveying random samples of Merit finalists in the 1958 Merit program who had indicated as their probable major field of study one of fifteen designated fields.

One of the questionnaire items asked: "Have you participated in an Honors program (special series of courses for undergraduates of outstanding promise or achievement) in your college? No—— Yes—— If yes, describe how your courses have differed from those of students not in the Honors program." Other questionnaire items asked the student to indicate the highest level of education he planned to complete—both as he recalled his plans when he first entered college and as they were at the time of responding.

From Table I it can be seen that many of these students entered college planning to do post-graduate study. Among participants in Honors programs seventy-three percent, while among non-participants in Honors programs fifty-seven percent, initially planned to do some type of post-graduate study. One-third of the Merit finalists in Honors programs initially planned to seek the Ph.D. degree, while only about a fifth of those not in Honors programs initially aimed this high.

The most important result in Table I, however, is the finding that at each initial expectation level participants in Honors programs more frequently raised their aspirations (or retained their initially high aims) than did non-participants. Treating reported plans at the beginning of college as "pretest," and plans after two years of college as "post-test," measures of aspirations, a covariance analysis was used to evaluate the statistical significance of the difference between adjusted post-test means. (In the covariance model post-test measures are adjusted to control pretest differences so that the effects of treatments can be studied.) The analysis shows that participation in Honors programs was associated with increased motivation to seek advanced degrees. Students in Honors programs had a significantly higher ad-

[1]Associate Director of Research, National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

justed post-test mean than did students not participating in Honors programs ($F = 7.07$, $p < .01$).

The present test probably gives a conservative estimate of the impact of Honors programs on student motivation to seek advanced training. As we have seen a large proportion of the Merit finalists had decided to do post-graduate work before they entered college, but this would not be true of groups less highly selected with respect to aptitude test scores. Note in Table I that the greatest effects were observed among those students who were not initially planning to do post-graduate work. In addition, Honors programs differ from the regular study program more markedly during the junior and senior years, and the effects upon student motivation should be greater when comparisons are made after the completion of college.

Participation of Merit finalists in Honors programs varied considerably by major field of study and by institution. The highest rate of participation was reported by History majors (46 percent) while the lowest rate was reported by students in Business and Commerce (20 percent). The remaining fields and the corresponding percentages of their prospective majors participating in Honors programs were as follows: Physics (40), Mathematics (37), Chemistry (36), Political Science (35), English (34), Languages (33), Philosophy (30), Engineering (27), Psychology (27), Education (26), Sociology (24), Biology (23), and Economics (22).

Although the 1061 Merit finalists are attending three hundred thirty-seven colleges and universities, only those enrolled at one hundred thirty-eight institutions reported they had participated in Honors programs. Since respondents were distributed among so many institutions the individual college ratios of participants to non-participants in Honors programs are unreliable. However, among the twenty-two colleges enrolling ten or

TABLE I

Changes in Educational Aspirations and Exposure to Honors Programs

Highest level student planned to complete at beginning of college	*Participants in Honors Programs*			*Students not Participating in Honors Programs*			Difference between columns 3 and 6
	Number of Students	Number and percent increasing aspirations during first two years of college*		Number of Students	Number and percent increasing aspirations during first two years of college*		
		N	PERCENT		N	PERCENT	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Some College	4	4	100	8	6	75	25
Bachelor's degree	88	61	69	302	175	58	11
Master's degree	83	30	36	153	49	32	4
Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., LL.B., etc.)	52	11	21	101	19	19	2
Ph.D. or equivalent	112	95	85	158	125	79	6
Total	339	201	59	722	374	52	7

*For students who initially planned to seek the Ph.D. degree, the number and percentage who still planned to seek the Ph.D. degree after two years of college are shown.

more of these students, the University of Michigan, Yale University, Radcliffe College, Harvard University and Stanford University had the largest percentages of the responding Merit finalists participating in Honors programs (77, 71, 52, 47 and 44, respectively).

In view of the evidence that participation in Honors programs seems to stimulate motivation to seek advanced training it is regrettable that more of these promising students were not exposed to Honors programs.[2] While a third of the Merit finalists planning to major in one of the above fifteen fields reported they had participated in Honors programs, the remaining two-thirds had not. Since most of these students rank in the top two percent of the distribution of aptitude for college it appears that many departments and colleges could do more for their talented undergraduates.

What are the salient characteristics of Honors programs from the student's point of view? The content analysis of questionnaire responses, shown in Table II, indicates that Honors courses are most frequently perceived to entail changes in course content (presentation of more advanced topics and problems, and an accelerated pace), in instructional methods (greater use of seminar and tutorial instruction), and in enforcement of curricular restrictions (increased opportunity for independent study, waiving of course and graduation prerequisites). In short, undergraduates believe their Honors courses are different from non-Honors courses, mainly with respect to the incorporation of teaching practices and instructional goals more characteristic of graduate study.

Editorial Comment

It is to be noted that the group studied by Dr. Thistlethwaite in the above report entered college in the fall of 1958. Since then our recent Inventory shows that seventy-five Honors programs have been inaugurated, many of them in large public institutions. Many institutions which had only upperclass programs are

TABLE II

Student Perceptions of Differences Between Honors and Regular Courses

Response to: "Describe how your (Honors) courses have differed from those of students not in the Honors program."*	Number and percent making each response among 339 participants	
	N	PERCENT
More advanced course content	102	30.2
Greater use of seminars and classroom discussions	58	17.2
Increased opportunity for independent study	45	13.3
Honors courses covered more material	42	12.4
Greater use of tutorial instructions	41	12.1
Required to complete Honors thesis or project	32	9.5
Relaxed requirements for admission to advanced courses	29	8.6
Better teachers in Honors courses	26	7.7
Increased assignments and greater demands for achievement	25	7.4
Relaxed curriculum requirements for graduation	25	7.4
Smaller classes	24	7.1

*Responses given by less than five percent of the participants in Honors programs are not listed. Percentages total to more than 100 since some students made more than one response.

[2]The names, qualifying test scores, and home addresses of 35,000 semifinalists and commended students in the 1960-61 NMSC competition have been sent to the colleges of the students' first and second choices.

now extending them back into the freshman year. It is therefore probably too early as yet to assess the full impact of Honors programs on motivation to seek advanced training.

We would anticipate also that such Honors students would in the future increasingly point to additional features differentiating their work from that of students who are not in programs. It is also worth noting that among the colleges and universities enrolling at least ten of the Merit finalists included in this study, the University of Michigan, which has had its program in operation since 1957, had the largest percentage participating in an Honors program. For the total group of finalists in 1958, one hundred forty-one of the seventy-one hundred whose college enrollments are known went to Michigan. Michigan ranked sixth among colleges and universities in the number of finalists choosing it in 1958. This was at a time when seventy percent of the finalists were choosing private colleges and universities.

Conferences

The College Committee on Outstanding Students

BUCK HILL FALLS CONFERENCE

March 26-29, 1961[1]

Two representatives from each of forty-five small, private liberal arts colleges[2] met at Buck Hill Falls to discuss the educational needs of outstanding students. Supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the conference was arranged by a newly established College Committee on Outstanding Students whose chairman is William E. Cadbury, Jr., dean, Haverford College. The other members of the Committee are Parker E. Lichtenstein, dean, Denison University; Hermann R. Muelder, dean, Knox College; and Ernest A. Strathmann, dean, Pomona College.

Also attending the conference were individual representatives from various national educational associations and foundations—A.A.C., A.C.E., E.T.S., N.E.A., N.S.F., John Hay Fellows Program, and the Carnegie, Danforth, Ford, and Woodrow Wilson Foundations.

The conferees were effectively directed to their tasks by Dean Cadbury, and President Howard F. Lowry of the College of Wooster gave the keynote address. Its chief emphasis was the need to create frameworks of expectation for outstanding and able students.

The conferees divided into six round

[1]Since a full report of the conference will eventually be published by the CCOS we limit ourselves here to a brief report.

[2]Allegheny, Amherst, Beloit, Birmingham Southern, Bryn Mawr, Carleton, Colby, Colorado College, Davidson, Denison, DePauw University, Earlham, Fisk University, Franklin & Marshall, Goucher, Grinnell, Hamilton, Haverford, Hollins, Holy Cross, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Knox, Lake Forest, Lawrence, Middlebury, Mills, Millsaps, Morehouse, Mt. Holyoke, Oberlin, Occidental, Pomona, Reed, University of the South, Swarthmore, Union, Vassar, Wabash, Washington & Lee, Wellesley, Wesleyan University, Whitman, Williams, and Wooster.

tables and met for three working sessions, one on "Special Problems of the Small Colleges," one on "The Transition from High School to College" and "The Early College Years," and a third on "The Later Years in College."

All four major themes were introduced in turn by addresses at general sessions by Joseph W. Cohen, director, ICSS; Charles R. Keller, director, John Hay Fellows Program; George R. Waggoner, dean, University of Kansas and ICSS Executive Committee member; and Elizabeth Paschal, associate program director, The Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Another general session on the theme of "Experiences with Outstanding Students" consisted of presentations by Byron Stookey, associate director, Program of Advanced Standing, Harvard College; C. H. Prentice, dean, Swarthmore College; and I. M. Stone, dean, Beloit College; respectively dealing with the Freshman Seminars at Harvard, the Swarthmore Honors Program and an experiment in inter-college cooperation.

Perhaps the best way briefly to summarize the content of this conference is to follow in the main the report of the final general session. This was brilliantly managed in a summary by Dean Strathmann who also called upon each reporter from the six round tables to elaborate on specific points most fully debated in his group.

The chief barriers to Honors programs were seen to be the indifference of administrations, expense, and departmental fear of encroachment. There was agreement, without unanimity, on the lack of sufficient challenge in regular freshman programs. The dissent chiefly came from those who were more concerned with the "sophomore slump"[3]—a frequently aired concept at the conference. Problems of identification were seen as involving criteria of creativity as well as intelligence, and as involving also the recognition of wide diversity of types among able students. An understandable reluctance to differentiate within small student bodies and a fear of destroying the community idea so characteristic of small colleges were countered with emphasis on the spill-over effect on all the other students and the rapidity with which such an effect can become manifest in a small college. The problem of evaluation of the success of programs brought up questions of outside examiners, national tests and the need for longitudinal studies after graduation.

The issues of breadth vs. depth, integration vs. specialization and research, interdisciplinary and divisional programs, and the appropriate arrangements for embracing all of these in a single program were likewise aired. Baleful references were made to the influence of the graduate and professional schools upon undergraduate teaching of outstanding students.

Special programs came under survey, such as study abroad, summer institutes, Harvard's Freshman Seminars, research assistantships, the Master of Arts in Teaching programs, and various distinctive approaches of individual colleges.

There was exploration in many directions beyond the traditional pattern for Honors – the "upperclass-departmental-independent study - senior thesis" syndrome. The seminar or colloquium method apparently generated considerable debate in the round tables, especially with regard to its advisability for freshmen and its mode of operation. The

---

[3]It is our own view in the ICSS that the "sophomore slump" is usually caused by the absence of special freshman-sophomore programs for the abler students. They come with high expectations which carry them through the freshman year, but then must usually await further engagement until their junior or senior years.

colloquium was seen in one group as the way to generate intellectual style. This discussion pointed up the misconception of Honors as merely a device for covering a greater quantity of work.

There was a final session at which Lloyd E. Worner, dean of Colorado College, reported for a special committee whose function it was to distill the recommendations emerging from the round tables. As a result of this report the conference adopted the following:

It is the consensus of this conference that the present committee be encouraged:

1. To explore ways and means to gather and disseminate information on the problems of the education of the outstanding student;

2. To study the possibilities of another conference preceded by smaller meetings on a regional or other basis within the next three or four years;

3. To seek financial support from such organizations as may be interested in such a proposal.

The present committee of four has been enlarged to perform the above tasks. Those added are Professors Carl M. Stevens, Department of Economics, Reed College; Henry B. Prickett, Department of English, Middlebury College; Howard H. Harlan, Department of Sociology, Birmingham-Southern College; and Scott B. Elledge, Department of English, Carleton College.

A STATEWIDE CONFERENCE ON HONORS IN ENGLISH

Two dozen representatives from four-year colleges and several two-year schools in Florida discussed Honors work in freshman English courses at the annual meeting of the FLORIDA COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, October 29, 1960.

The program was chaired by Warren French of the University College, University of Florida, who opened the discussion by pointing out that the problem of providing Honors work for superior students had become especially serious and urgent since the "quality colleges" were no longer able to accommodate all of even the most outstanding students. This means that the state, private and even community colleges must make more extensive provision than previously for the needs of these students.

William E. Taylor of Stetson University described his school's response to this challenge, their method of selection, and the contents of a special freshman English "seminar" that has been offered for two years.* He also explained how this course fits into their four-year Honors program,** and how it related to the special accelerated summer program that enables superior high school juniors to begin college during what would normally be their senior year in high school.

Donald Harkness of the newly opened University of South Florida (Tampa) discussed methods by which schools that are not prepared to offer Honors courses may adequately challenge superior students enrolled in the regular freshman English course by working out special Honors projects. He stressed that supervision of such projects was necessary because freshmen require close, sympathetic direction. Such work can benefit the instructor if students are permitted and encouraged to work in areas of interest to him. Professor Harkness argued that not every instructor is suited for directing Honors work and that Honors students should not be assigned to instructors as a "reward" for long service.

Philip Bradshaw of the University of Florida added valuable information about the various types of Honors projects attempted by freshmen under his direction.

Jayne Harder, head of the English Department at Daytona Beach Junior College,

* See John Hicks, "Stetson's New Honors Seminars for Freshmen and Sophomores," THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (May-June, 1959) 18.
** See John A. Hague, "Growth of the Honors Program at Stetson University," THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (December 1960) 15.

then delivered a somewhat disturbing report about conditions in the state's junior colleges. No Honors programs were currently operating in any of these schools, she explained. Because of the crowded conditions and community-service emphasis at most of them, the establishment of Honors courses seemed remote. Superior students at the many two-year colleges only recently established in rapidly-growing communities would have to rely for the present on what personal assistance overloaded instructors could give them. Generally, there were not enough superior students, capable instructors, or sympathetic administrators at the schools to make the contemplation of Honors programs advisable.***

During the discussion period, representatives of Rollins and Barry College and the long-established St. Petersburg Junior College discussed the movement toward Honors work in freshman English at their schools.

HONORS CONFERENCE—MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

In recent years Michigan Community Colleges have indicated an interest in Honors offerings for abler students. At present Honors programs are in various stages of operation or planning at the Flint Community Junior College, Port Huron Junior College, Grand Rapids Junior College, and the Kellogg Community College. To share Honors experiences and perhaps stimulate interest, the Michigan Association of Junior Colleges sponsored an Honors Conference on March 17, 1961, at the Flint campus, under the chairmanship of A. Martin Eldersveld, dean of instructional affairs, Grand Rapids Junior College. Twelve colleges and several high schools were represented.

Local, state and national leaders in Honors presented the following addresses: "Philosophy and Objectives of an Honors Program" by Stanley J. Idzerda, director of the Honors College, Michigan State University; "Implementation and Appraisal of an Honors Program" by James H. Robertson, member of the ICSS Executive Committee and associate dean of the College of Literature, Science and Arts, University of Michigan; and "Honors in the Community-Junior College," the theme of the conference, by Thomas B. Merson, assistant director for commissions, American Association of Junior Colleges.

Following the luncheon session, Searle F. Charles, assistant dean and director of the Honors Program at Flint Community Junior College, presided as chairman of a panel on which the three morning speakers served. The panelists and conference members discussed the following topics: selection and retention, financing, community relationships, Honors in terminal programs, and class attendance. A summary report and transcript of this panel discussion, the manuscripts of the three morning speeches, and various materials concerning Honors programs at other institutions, including a report on Honors programs in California Junior Colleges, were mailed to each conference participant.

●

There will be a session on Honors programs at the 1960-61 PACIFIC NORTHWEST CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION to be held June 22-24 at the UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON.

●

An All-Ohio Conference on Honors was held May 6 at KENT STATE UNIVERSITY. R. E. JOHNSON, director, University Honors Program, University of Illinois, and member of the ICSS Executive Committe, gave the luncheon address. JAMES KAREN OLSEN, director of the Honors Program, Kent State University, arranged the conference and was general chairman. A report on the conference will appear in the next issue of the Newsletter.

***The director of the ICSS, J. W. Cohen, gave an address on Honors programs at the American Association of Junior Colleges convention in Washington, D.C., March 3.

MORE ON THE COLLOQUIUM*

Modern Views of Man

An Honors Seminar at The City College of New York

HENRY MAGID and HENRY WASSER[1]

Several years ago proposals were considered by The City College which were designed to supplement departmental Honors programs with a series of interdepartmental seminars organized on a regular course basis with both students and staff from different departments. Those interested in this new program felt that there was a tendency for departmental work to get more and more specialized. "Integrated" courses at the elementary level were rejected because they frequently failed to give students an adequate grounding in specific fields. It was decided to offer seminars in the upper college, chiefly for seniors, to those students who had completed the major portion of their required work and who were for the most part well-advanced in at least one special field of study.

How this program has worked out over the past two years can be judged from the experience with the first of these seminars, that on "Modern Views of Man." Able students from all three divisions of the liberal arts college as well as from the school of technology have been attracted. This course is organized on a two-semester basis with new students permitted to enter each semester. This flexibility was achieved by concentrating on European materials in one semester and American materials in the other. The materials used have been drawn from the works of novelists, poets, social and natural scientists, and philosophers. Representative authors include Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, T. S. Eliot, Freud, Marx and Engels, E. M. Forster, Sartre, William James, Dewey, Nietzsche, Tillich, Camus, Unamuno, Ibsen, Schrödinger, Benda, Riesman, Santayana, Zola. Students are required to read a book or a substantial part thereof each week, and two seventy-five minute sessions are devoted to its discussion. Every other week each student is required to write a short paper on some aspect of the view of man being considered at the time. The papers are intended to be analytic and specific and are frequently read in the Seminar where they provide a basis for discussion.

In the Seminar meetings, the instructors try to limit themselves to raising questions, clarifying points of view, providing specific information where necessary, and keeping the discussion on the main issues. No effort is made to arrive at final or definitive answers, although the reading of the students' papers indicates that they reach their own conclusions.

In addition to short papers, a longer paper requiring the comparison of at least two of the views discussed is submitted at the end of each term. The

---

*The preceding issue of THE SUPERIOR STUDENT was denoted to discussion of the colloquium.

[1]Professor Magid is a member of the Department of Philosophy, and Professor Wasser is a member of the Department of English at The City College.

paper is read by each instructor and graded separately. These grades are combined at the end of the term to provide a rating for the student's record.

A final examination was experimented with the first semester but was abandoned when it proved to be a superfluous and unnecessary burden on the student. The discussions, in which every student has a responsibility to participate, and the papers, up to five or six a semester, provide a more than adequate basis for grading.

In the last year, the regular instructors of the course, one from English and one from philosophy, have been joined by a physicist for the discussion of Schrödinger's *What is Life?*, a psychoanalyst for the discussion of Freud, an economist for the discussion of Veblen, a sociologist for the discussion of Reisman, and a literary critic for the discussion of Santayana.

The enthusiasm of the students, as evidenced by their oral contributions, their willingness to work and the quality of their efforts, is ample proof, the instructors believe, both of the need for and the value of such courses. As each term progresses, it is heartening to see the reticent students drawn more and more into the discussion, the aggressive students cut down to size by their peers, new and strange points of view discovered, issues clarified, and views of man more sharply delineated. Incidental but important by-products are the development of facility in oral expression and the acquisition of techniques involved in the "give and take" of discussion. In this respect, it is thought, the work of the Seminar is a valuable preparation both for graduate study and for college teaching.

This particular Seminar is only the first of a series of such seminars. Under contemplation are seminars in the "Philosophy of Science" and in "Oriental Studies." It is thought that the College's new program for gifted students, which is designed to enable them to complete all their required work by the end of the second year, will create an increasing demand for Honors work, both research and seminar. Thus it is hoped that several Honors seminars can be offered simultaneously to meet these growing needs.

Colloquium for Freshmen

University of New Mexico

DUDLEY WYNN[1]

The Freshman Colloquium has as its aim the development of skill and meaningfulness in the reading and discussion of a widely ranging variety of texts. A book a week is read and discussed in each section of a two-hour colloquium conducted by two instructors. To begin discussion, students are required to prepare a short paper on some aspect of the week's reading which particularly impressed them; they are not to turn in a book report or a summary or any conventional composition. Titles vary from section to section and from semester to semester. They include literary works (*Fathers and Sons, The Selected Poems of Robert Frost, Hamlet*), classics in political science (*The Prince, On Liberty*) or in sociology (*Caste and Class in a Southern Town*), and occasionally a book in science (*Fundamental Principles of Algebra and Geometry*). The instructors

[1]Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of New Mexico.

are completely free to select their own titles; many do so simply to satisfy their own curiosity and wishes; some change their titles every semester; most select titles they have not read and would not normally have a chance to read but for their colloquium work.

The students come from different departments and from different colleges. We require students entering the program in the sophomore year to take at least one semester of Freshman Colloquium. All this produces a highly diverse group, in age, in college objective, in background, in perspective.

Students have remarked that, once they understand what is required of them, they are likely to put in more time for the two-hour colloquium than for any other course. Instructors certainly put in more time than for a normal course since the reading material each week is new and sometimes strange (as when a scientist has to read a volume of poems, or an English teacher, an introduction to geology), and since the students' papers are read and commented on by both instructors. (Final grades are based on a combination of class work and papers.)

A determined attempt is made to pair off instructors from different departments, even from different colleges. Thus, some colloquia have been taught by instructors from mathematics, biology, psychology, or chemistry and from history, philosophy, languages, or English; one colloquium for the past year has been conducted by a professor of business administration (a lawyer) and a professor of English.

It is hoped that the natural tensions existing between various disciplines will encourage an atmosphere of unrelenting inquiry. Although a "dialogue" will naturally develop between the instructors, the intention is to involve all the students in the discussion, to create a "colloquium" of free, searching, intelligent commentary and challenge. We hope to "teach" nothing specific in the colloquia except perhaps the most important thing of all: the complexity and interrelatedness of intellectual activity of every sort. We hope to make the shallow student less positive of his various unqualified commitments; we hope to give the uncommitted student a sense of the intellectual terrain and perhaps even a sense of direction.

The Education Honors Seminars

Boston College[1]

GEORGE E. McDONALD[2]

The sophomore Honors seminars in Education at Boston College are conducted by a seminar professor and senior Honors students. The seminars are taped and evaluated by independent evaluators. Professor McDonald here discusses some of the reactions to the evaluation:

The seminar professor and senior leaders come to each seminar session hoping to create a lively discussion of certain aspects of, let us say, MacIver's *Academic Freedom* or Maritain's *Man and the State*. Their chief responsibility as they perceived it at close range was to initiate, maintain and conclude discussion by the sophomore members of the seminar. Since their major difficulty had consisted in getting these seminar sessions "off the

[1]See "An Honors Program in Education at Boston College," THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (December 1959) 11.
[2]A former director of the School of Education Honors Program, Boston College; at present Professor of Education, Assumption College. This article was part of an analysis of many more features of the Program.

ground," they felt that they had achieved success when there was an intelligent expression of viewpoints followed by a lively and fruitful exchange of ideas. As a consequence the Honors staff was a little mystified at times when its warm enthusiasm for a session just concluded was met with the polite but detached observation of the evaluators that participation was limited to too few students and was too narrow in the range of ideas covered.

Gradually it became clear to the Honors staff members that, unlike the evaluators, they regarded objectives in specific hierarchical or vertical terms. The chief function of the seminars, they thought, was to center attention upon the intelligibility of an author's work or of a philosophic theme in education, especially as this intelligibility was made manifest in the judgments of the students themselves. Nevertheless there was a tendency to permit discussion to remain at the level of very personal responses to the works rather than to attempt to arrive at any "objective" meanings. As a result the oftentimes deeply personal insights of discussants were shared with enthusiasm and delight while achievement of skills—reasoning, reading, speaking and listening—and development of attitudes—cooperation with one's peers, respect for the opinions of others, individual initiative, and an increased sense of intellectual or professional responsibility – were given secondary emphasis by the staff. One assumption that was implicit in the direction of the seminars was that the physical, psychological and intellectual environment of the seminar circle constituted a matrix out of which would develop the hoped for skills and attitudes. Consequently enrichment of the intuitive tendencies of the mind through knowledge was the immediate objective directly aimed at in the seminars while other objectives, such as those stressed by the evaluators, were pursued in an indirect manner.

Brief Descriptions Of Honors Colloquia

In the 1960-61 Honors Inventory[1] some eighty institutions indicated that they offered Honors colloquia. The ICSS has received descriptions, reading lists and syllabi of colloquia from about thirty of these institutions. Several persons also sent detailed replies to an ICSS inquiry on colloquia.

A list of institutions offering colloquia has been prepared and will be sent on request. The list includes the titles of many coloquia and an indication of those with prepared reading lists and outlines.

The following brief statements indicate something of the range of topics, organization and readings. As a concrete illustration of actual colloquia, they help round out the picture presented in this and the preceding newsletter.

BROWN UNIVERSITY *University Courses in Interdisciplinary Studies*[2]

It is the purpose of these courses, which are attached to no department, to provide stu-

---

[1]See THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (January 1961).

[2]These courses are a follow-up at the upperclass level of the "Identification and Criticism of Ideas Program." This Program is described by John Rowe Workman in *New Horizons of Higher Education: Innovation and Experimentation at Brown University* (Washington, DC.: Public Affairs Press, 1959).

dents at appropriate stages in their college careers with the chance to integrate their understanding of the various intellectual disciplines and to establish meaningful relations among the diverse forms of human intellectual experience. The following is an example of one of these courses:

Modes of Experience: Science, History, Philosophy and the Arts. This course is concerned with four major areas of human experience and their roles in life. Its aim is to stimulate the students' awareness of the critical importance of drawing together into a significant whole the manifold modes of experience, and to help them begin this lifelong process of integration. Its plan is to provide actual experience with selected instances from the various realms and, on this basis, to consider the nature of these experiences, the attitudes they involve, their relations to the totality of experience, their similarities, differences and conflicts, and their complementary roles in life. The course will be carried on primarily through discussion of readings in original sources of science, history and philosophy; of certain poems, musical compositions and paintings; and of works dealing with the relations of all these.

COLORADO COLLEGE *Colloquium on Freedom and Authority*

A. THE RELATION OF MAN TO HIMSELF

What should be authoritative for the individual when he formulates his deepest beliefs? Should it be reason? intuition? experience of the world? inherited religious faith? science? tradition? How can he make these beliefs actually directive of his life? What is the individual to do when his freedom to assert his convictions conflicts with state authority or social mores or established religion? How can he preserve integrity in the hurly-burly of the world? We shall deal specifically with these and other questions in the first section and refer to them throughout this course. The readings are as follows:

Plato, **The Apology, Crito**
Tolstoy, **Death of Ivan Illyich**
Voltaire, **Candide**
Goethe, **Faust**
Marcus Aurelius, **Meditations**
Epictetus, **Enchiridion**
MacLeish, **J. B.**

B. THE RELATION OF MAN TO THE STATE

How can we keep a balance between individual liberty and social order, between freedom and authority? How should authority and power be distributed within the state—among the several states or in a central government? How far can the majority be entrusted with power and control? What is the relation of freedom and security in our complex modern society? How can we retain the integrity and sanctity of the individual in a period of contending nations? What right, if any, does the individual have to disobey laws? How can we answer Lincoln's question: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence?" These and other questions will concern us in the second half of the first semester. The readings are as follows:

Thucydides, **The Peloponnesian War**
Marx and Engels, **The Communist Manifesto**
The Federalist
Aristotle, **Politics**
Crossman, ed., **The God that Failed**
Lippmann, **The Public Philosophy**

C. THE RELATION OF MAN TO SOCIETY

Psychologists, anthropologists and sociologists have made us aware of the central role of customs, mores, and social patterns in making individuals what they are. Does this mean the individual is merely a product of any given society? Is the authority of customs and habit absolute? Does one have any legitimate freedom to defy established customs, folkways and conventions? Can we hope to change the sociological patterns of the community, or must we bow to them? What is the source of social ideals? Can we distinguish any plan or direc-

tion in social change? These are some of the major questions to which we seek answers in this part of the course. The readings are as follows:

Mill, **On Liberty**
Freud, **Civilization and its Discontents**
Riesman, **The Lonely Crowd**
Miller, **Death of a Salesman**
Dollard, **Caste and Class in a Southern Town**

D. THE RELATION OF MAN TO GOD

What is the meaning of divine authority, of human freedom and dignity in relation to God? Can we establish God's existence rationally? What beliefs about the goodness or badness of human nature are implied by Catholicism, Protestantism, Humanism, Skepticism? What is the role of feeling, of mysticism, of science in religion? How do we relate our religious faith to the social, political, and economic spheres of daily living? These are some of the questions we try to answer in this part. The readings are as follows:

Dostoyevsky, **The Grand Inquisitor**
Adam, **The Spirit of Catholicism**
Camus, **The Plague**
Hume, **Dialogues on Natural Religion**
Dewey, **A Common Faith**
Tillich, **Dynamics of Faith**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY *Interdepartmental Colloquium on Peace and War*

The Seminar will not try to answer the question, "How can war be abolished?" Instead it will attempt a reasonable discussion of the phenomenon of war in human society in general terms with a view to identifying or isolating the most basic and common causes of war, analyzing the nature of warlike conflicts, and examining the transformation of such conflicts from local to global conflagrations. The group may also profitably investigate the nature of war in historical perspective: is it inevitable, is it necessary? Are there conditions of permanent peace that can rule out the recurrence of war, or eliminate its occurence.

If peace is the antithesis of war, are there conditions that are essential for peace? Is there universal agreement on the nature of these conditions and the means of producing them, or making it possible for them to obtain? Are peace and war mutually exclusive? What is the relative significance of the term **peace** in a culturally and politically fragmented globe, which is also economically imbalanced? Can we formulate a theory of balance or equilibrium that is a prerequisite to peace? What is the relation between the modern armaments race, and its corollary imperative of disarmament, to the achievement of peace?

Texts:

Daedalus, Special Issue: "Arms Control" (Fall 1960)
W. W. Rostow, **The United States in the World Arena**
T. C. Schelling, **The Strategy of Conflict**

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY *Freshman Colloquium: Four Perspectives of Classical Greece*

This is a two-credit course which meets once each week. Students read, discuss and evaluate a few selected works. These works have had—and still have—great significance in our own culture. Selections read include such works as Thucydides' **The Peloponnesian War;** some tragedies by Aeschylus and Sophocles; some selections from Aristotle's **On the Art of Poetry** and a few of Plato's **Dialogues.** An additional unit of the course includes a brief introduction to some prominent and representative features of Greek art. Class discussions and short written reports are an important part of class procedure. Each member of the class is expected to do some independent work, pursuing his special interests in the area.

OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE *Junior Honors Seminar*

The Seminar is conducted by three members of the faculty, representing the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities, and runs throughout the year. The topic for the first semester is "The Anatomy of Knowing." This is an introductory attempt at interdisciplinary thinking and research. The fundamental problem engaged here is the problem of knowledge itself, as approached from various points of view. How, for example, does the "knowledge" of the poet differ from that of the physicist or the politicial scientist? What are the various means by which conclusions are reached and evalulated in the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities? Students are furnished a preliminary reading list at the beginning of the summer, to help them prepare for the Seminar. This year's list was as follows:

Beveridge, **The Art of Scientific Investigation**
Cassirer, **Essay on Man**
Cassirer, **Language and Myth**
Conant, **On Understanding Science**
Easton, **The Political System**
Hayakawa, **Language in Thought and Action**
Langer, **Philosophy in a New Key**
Lasswell and Kaplan, **The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method**
Rapoport, **Operational Philosophy**
Schrödinger, **Science Theory and Man**
Weldon, **Vocabulary of Politics**
Wellek and Warren, **Theory of Literature**

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, College of Business Administration

Conjoint Honors Colloquium on the Influence of Religion, Morality and Ethics upon American Business and its Development

The Colloquium offers the opportunity of exploring jointly the role of religion, morals and ethics in the development and behavior of American business enterprise. Moral and ethical precepts are primarily personal rather than organizational in their application. Yet it is often believed that morality and ethics based on religion are fundamental to business as an institution.

The dilemma for the businessman is observed in his attempt to reconcile the "impersonal imperative of profit and efficiency" in business with the "personal imperative of Christian ethics." Perhaps the dilemma for business (and society) in a wider sense was expressed by John Wesley in his statement that ". . . religion makes a man frugal, and frugality begets wealth. Wealth makes a man indifferent to religion, so it seems that religion destroys itself." Parenthetically, it might be asked if the accumulation of wealth (business) is destroyed by the absence of religion.

If John Wesley is right, a significant force in the rise and development of capitalism has spent itself. What then are the guides, if any, to morality and ethics in the conduct of business today? In brief, the objectives of the Colloquium are to explore the nature of morality and ethics, their application to business and an evaluation of their influences upon business conduct

●

A warning not to ignore the "other-gifted" in our excitement over the academically gifted has been sounded by EUGENE S. WILSON, dean of admissions, Amherst College. In an article entitled "Who Are the Gifted?" in the Winter 1961 issue of **College and University,** he takes note of the increasing emphasis on the academically talented and warns against the danger of elitism. "The danger," he says, "comes not from the separation (of the talented) but from our (teachers' and parents') attitudes toward the students who are separated. Our language and our actions reveal our attitudes." The remedy?—emphasis on the partnership of the other-gifted and the academically gifted in our educational institutions.

PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

This past fall INDIANA UNIVERSITY established an All University Honors Committee, with a representative from each of the four professional undergraduate schools and several from the Honors Program of the College of Arts and Sciences. This new committee has been active in developing new plans for Honors programs in each of the schools, in coordinating efforts so that university-wide opportunities will be open to all students, and in pressing for an extension of Honors work to areas not now engaged in it. E. R. WICKER of the Department of Economics is chairman of the Honors Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences; WARNER O. CHAPMAN of the Department of Government is chairman of the All University Honors Committee and has prepared a comprehensive proposal for an All University Honors Program. This proposal incorporates nearly every feature in the ICSS recommendations for a full Honors program.* A briefer proposal for an Honors College at Indiana has been prepared by BYRON DOENGES, assistant dean, and a brochure has been published on the present program.

As further signs of interest in Honors at Indiana, MICHAEL SCRIVEN, professor of the Logic of Science, has prepared several memoranda on Honors, and a student committee undertook an investigation "to find some manner of stimulating the superior student in his academic work during his sophomore and freshman years." A report on the committee's findings has been prepared.

●

The Honors Council and the Department of Political Science of the UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN have announced the appointment of HAROLD STEIN of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at PRINCETON as first visiting Honors professor. Distinguished faculty members from other institutions will be invited to spend an academic year at Ann Arbor. The visitors generally will teach one departmental course and one upperclass interdepartmental Honors seminar.

●

An Honors program beginning with freshmen will get under way next fall in the College of Arts and Sciences of the UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON. An Ad Hoc Committee on Honors Programs recently recommended a College Honors Program beginning with the freshman year. It will incorporate individual departmental Honors requirements which are presently concentrated in the junior and senior years.

Recognizing that all the details of a four-year Honors program cannot be, and should not be, determined in advance of the initiation of a program, the Committee recommended that a Director of Honors and an Honors Council be appointed and charged with the development of the Honors Program through the next four years beginning next fall with freshmen. The Committee also suggested that the Director and Council should have wide latitude in experimenting during the first year.

Dean SOLOMON KATZ has appointed an Honors Council and Director, BARNET BASKERVILLE of the Department of Speech. They are already at work selecting freshmen who have been admitted to the University on the basis of seven semesters of high school work, using a 3.5 high school grade-point average as the initial cutting line. This criterion is supplemented with evidence from the University's own battery of tests given in the high schools, the College Board examinations, and National Merit scores. The freshman program will consist largely of special sections of existing courses, with members of the Honors Council serving as advisers.

*See THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (February 1961) 23.

GRANTS

In an extension of its past programs the NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION now offers support to colleges and universities to provide opportunities for qualified undergraduates to participate in research or independent study, not only in the natural and engineering sciences, but also in anthropology, geography, psychology (excluding clinical psychology), sociology (excluding social work), economics (excluding business administration), and the history and philosophy of science. Also included are interdisciplinary areas overlapping two or more sciences (such as biochemistry, biophysics, geochemistry, meteorology, oceanography, statistics and statistical design). The fields of research and study covered are limited to those which conform to accepted standards of scientific inquiry by fulfilling the requirements of objectivity, verifiability, and generality. A brochure on "Suggestions for Preparation of Proposals" is available from the NSF.

For the coming year grants totaling nearly three and a quarter million dollars will enable undergraduates to do independent study or research along with scientists in science, mathematics or engineering in more than two hundred fifty colleges and universities. Lists of the participating institutions with the names of program directors may be obtained from the NSF.

In announcing the grants, DR. ALAN T. WATERMAN, director of the NSF, said, "The Undergraduate Research Participation Program is one way to aid and encourage colleges and universities to provide research or comparable experience to a comparatively small number of highly selected students with a view to accelerating and deepening those students' education in the sciences."

●

The POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE OF BROOKLYN inaugurated a Unified Honors Program last fall with a five-year supporting grant of $700,000 from the FORD FOUNDATION. The over-all objective is to provide an integrated doctoral program for gifted students from the freshman semester on till the conclusion of the dissertation. The plans provide for no strict dividing line between graduate and undergraduate studies and the student's rate of advancement is governed by his progress. If it is warranted, he may obtain his doctorate in six years. The freshman and sophomore curriculum is common to all students. In the course of these two years, they are exposed to the fundamental ideas and methods of the pure sciences and to theories and techniques of engineering analysis of an interdisciplinary nature. In his third year the student elects a major in any one of the departments of the Institute. For the remainder of the curriculum, a program of minimal course work is planned with seminars, independent study, and participation in current research projects at the Institute.

The Honors Program in the Electrical Engineering Department* will be absorbed by the Unified Honors Program when the present freshmen become juniors and choose a departmental major. The director of the Program is A. G. SCHILLINGER.

ATTENTION HONORS DIRECTORS

Institutions considering the establishment of an Honors Center may wish to contact EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES LABORATORIES, 477 Madison Ave., New York. EFL, supported by funds from the FORD FOUNDATION, acts as a clearinghouse for information and makes grants for research and experimentation in all types of educational facilities. One of its concerns is providing an environment for "civilized contact" on the campus.

---

*See "An Honors Program in Electrical Engineering," THE SUPERIOR STUDENT (November 1959) 12.

ADDITIONAL HONORS BROCHURES

Lists of printed Honors brochures have appeared in the September and November 1960 issues of THE SUPERIOR STUDENT. Since then, additional brochures have been received from the institutions below. The names in parentheses are of persons from whom further information may be obtained.

Ball State Teachers College *(Jerome A. Fallon)*
Boston College, College of Business Administration *(Raymond J. Aherne)*
University of Colorado, College of Engineering *(Frank Kreith)*
DePauw University *(Robert H. Farber)*
Flint Community Junior College *(Marie R. Prahl)*
Gonzaga University *(John P. Leary, S.J.)*
Greenville College *(Edwin L. Lyle)*
Hamline University *(Charles R. Wimmer)*
University of Illinois, College of Commerce and Business Administration *(Walter W. McMahon)*
Indiana University, College of Arts & Sciences *(E. R. Wicker)*
Iowa State University, College of Engineering *(George R. Town)*
Odessa College *(Luis M. Morton, Jr.)*
Roosevelt University *(Otto Wirth)*
College of St. Catherine *(Sister M. Rosalie)*
University of Tennessee *(James F. Davidson)*
Tri-College Program: St. Benedicts, St. Cloud State, St. John's *(Edward Henry)*
Xavier University (Cincinnati) *(W. P. Hetherington, S.J.)*

ICSS NOTES

N. D. Kurland addressed the Denver meeting of the American College Personnel Association March 27 on "Implications of Superior Student Programs for Student Personnel Work."

J. W. Cohen gave an address April 28 on "Developing Leaders and Academically Talented Students" during a conference held in conjunction with the inauguration of Jerome H. Holland, new president of Hampton Institute. He concentrated on the problem of values and dedication to them in the education of the gifted student. Copies of this address are available from the ICSS office.

While in the east Professor Cohen visited Rutgers University and the University of Delaware. In Washington he met with officials of the U. S. Office of Education, the NEA and the NSF.

ICSS Executive Committee members R. E. Johnson, James Robertson and George Waggoner participated in several conferences reported elsewhere in this issue.

McKenna 229
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colo.

Second Class
Postage Paid
at Boulder, Colo.

the superior student

J. W. Cohen, Director and Editor-in-Chief
N. D. Kurland, Associate Director and Editor
J. C. Garland, Coordinator of Information

Executive Committee: E. A. Cameron, N. Carolina; J. H. Franklin, Brooklyn; R. E. Johnson, Illinois; R. B. MacLeod, Cornell; M. Mead, American Museum, N.Y.C.; H. H. Quint, Massachusetts; J. H. Robertson, Michigan; E. W. Strong, California; C. G. Taylor, Louisiana State; G. R. Waggoner, Kansas; W. D. Weir, Colorado; D. Wynn, New Mexico.